

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT
DIVISION FOUR

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

CHRISTOPHER GEORGE JACKSON,

Defendant and Appellant.

B241146

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. KA089101)

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Bruce F. Marrs, Judge. Affirmed.

Jonathan B. Steiner, California Appellate Project Executive Director, and Suzan E. Hier, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Defendant Christopher George Jackson appeals from the trial court order denying his motion to award additional days of conduct credit. We affirm.

The record on appeal is quite sparse. According to the motion defendant filed in the superior court, on September 15, 2011, he was sentenced to six years in state prison following his conviction for inflicting corporal and great bodily injury on a spouse. (Pen. Code, §§ 273.5, subd. (a); 12022.7, subd. (a).)¹ Defendant was awarded 637 days of custody credit and 95 days of conduct credit for a total of 732 days of presentence credit.

On April 24, 2012, defendant filed the motion at issue, contending that he was entitled to additional conduct credits pursuant to section 4019. The trial court denied the motion, noting that defendant's conduct credits were properly calculated pursuant to section 2933.1. This appeal followed.

Defendant's appointed appellate counsel filed a *Wende* brief (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436), asking this court to independently review the record to determine whether appealable issues exist. Counsel filed a declaration stating that she was writing to defendant to explain the nature of the brief she had filed and to inform him of his right to file a supplemental brief. She was also sending him the record on appeal.

On July 25, 2012, we advised defendant that he had 30 days to submit any issues that he wished us to consider. To date, we have received no response.

Defendant concedes he was convicted of personally inflicting great bodily injury upon the victim within the meaning of section 12022.7, subdivision (a) in the course of violating section 273.5, subdivision (a). Thus, he was convicted of a violent felony. (§ 667.5, subd. (c)(8).) Section 2933.1 provides that any person convicted of a violent felony "shall accrue no more than 15 percent of worktime credit." The 95 days of conduct credit defendant received at the time of sentencing was properly calculated pursuant to this section.

¹ All further statutory references are to the Penal Code.

We have independently reviewed the record and are satisfied no arguable issues exist. Defendant has received effective appellate review of the order entered. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 277-279; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 123-124.)

The order denying defendant additional conduct credits is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

SUZUKAWA, J.

We concur:

EPSTEIN, P. J.

MANELLA, J.